



**Executive Committee Meeting  
August 16, 2001  
Draft - Meeting Summary**

*The following is a summary of presentations given, issues raised, actions undertaken or recommendations made. When possible, lengthy discussions have been summarized into themes or summary statements.*

**Executive Committee members present:**

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> George Kargianis<br>Chair                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Rob McKenna<br>Vice-Chair, King County            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan Mathis<br>FHWA                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sants Contreras (Alt.)<br>City of Kirkland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sen. Horn<br>WA State Senate           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Hopkins (Alt.)<br>King County       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Connie Marshall<br>City of Bellevue        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bob Edwards<br>PSRC                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Randy Corman<br>City of Renton            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> John Okamoto<br>WSDOT                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rosemarie Ives<br>City of Redmond      | <input type="checkbox"/> Steve Mullet<br>City of Tukwila                      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dick Paylor (Alt.)<br>City of Bothell      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joan McBride<br>City of Kirkland       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grant Deginger (Alt.)<br>City of Bellevue |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sonny Putter (Alt.)<br>City of Newcastle   | <input type="checkbox"/> Pam Carter (Alt.)<br>City of Tukwila              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aubrey Davis (Alt.)<br>WSTC               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Dye (Alt.)<br>WSDOT                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barbara Cothorn<br>Snohomish County    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dave Somers<br>Snohomish County           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Cheryl Pflug<br>WA State House of Reps.          | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Christopher Hurst<br>WA State House of Reps. | <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Margarita Prentice<br>WA State Senate           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Julia Peterson (Alt.)<br>WA State Senate         |  |   |

### **Staff and Observers**

Johannes Kurz, Snohomish County  
Bruce Nurse, Kemper Development

Chris Johnson, KC Council  
Janet Ray, AAA  
Helena Kennedy-Smith, WSDOT

Kim Becklund, Bellevue  
Ward Truess, (Alt.) ETP  
Todd Woosely  
David Hopkins, King County

Len Newstrum, Citizens Committee

### **Project Management Team**

Mike Cummings, WSDOT  
Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates  
Keith McGowan, McGowan Environmental  
Ron Anderson, DEA  
Phil Fordyce, WSDOT  
Kim Farley, WSDOT

Rita Brogan, PRR  
Brian O'Sullivan- Sound Transit  
Ann Martin, King County  
Melanie Moores, WSDOT  
Christina Martinez, WSDOT

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Kargianis called the meeting to order at 9:17 a.m. and stated the meeting's agenda:

- Program Update
  - Schedule Update
  - Funding and Phasing Update
  - Outreach Working Group Update
- Draft EIS Update
  - Draft EIS Overview
  - Public Outreach Activities
- Environmental Analysis Workshop
  - Review Policies and Issues Identified
  - Highlights from Analysis Results
  - Discussion on Environmental Issues and Mitigation Opportunities

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Prior to asking for public comment, Chairman Kargianis introduced Dan Mathis, FHWA, who is replacing Mr. Fong.

Todd Woosely, a public observer representing Seattle realtors, complimented the program on getting this far and obtaining consensus. He urged the committee to maintain consensus during the DEIS comment period. He requested equal and fair treatment for everyone's input. He said he felt that some groups were allowed to make comments regarding a 5<sup>th</sup> alternative and this was unfair. However, he agreed with the Executive Committee's response to these groups.

Chairman Kargianis emphasized that openness is a key part of the program and that all public comments are appreciated. He noted that there has been good public participation so far.

Ward Cruces, a from the Eastside Transportation Partnership, thanked the program for identifying ways to improve the corridor. He said he hopes as the committee evaluates the alternatives they keep in mind the mandate they have to people along the corridor to decrease congestion and improve quality of life. He hopes the decision will decrease time spent in traffic on I-405 and

increase the time families are able to spend together. ETC is proud to have participated over the past two years and looks forward to contributing future comments during the public comment period. He said the ETP doesn't want to lose the PPA in the final decision.

Chairman Kargianis emphasized that program improvements will take care of future growth, as well as current congestion. He asked if other members of the public wanted to comment. There were no others.

Chairman Kargianis called for approval of the last meeting summary. The committee approved.

#### **PROGRAM UPDATE**

Chairman turned the meeting over to Mike Cummings. Mr. Cummings announced that David Dye, WSDOT, is the new Urban Corridors Administrator as a result of the recent reorganization of WSDOT. David Dye passed out the new organization chart. The primary focus of the reorganization is on delivery of projects. In the past, pieces of work haven't been under one roof and have not been well coordinated. Mr. Dye now works within the new Urban Corridors group which is in charge of getting the projects completed. Craig Stone will be heading up the I-405 Corridor Program team after the EIS is completed. Mike Cummings is now also in the Urban Corridors department. Mr. Dye emphasized the organization chart is a working model and is not the typical WSDOT approach. He invited comments and input.

Chairman Kargianis noted the chart emphasized work on the corridors. He invited WSDOT to present the same presentation they made at a past Commissioners Meeting to the Executive Committee in the future.

Mr. Cummings proceeded with a schedule update for the program. The next meetings for the Executive Committee will be:

- Managed Lanes – Sept. 25
- Public Hearings – Sept. 18, 19, 20
- All Committees Meeting – Oct. 11
- PA Recommendation – October 30

Mr. Cummings noted the scheduling format of Steering and Citizen meetings before the Executive meeting is out of normal sequence because the team needs to give more detailed environmental information to the Steering and Citizen's committees. The program schedule is based on a 45-day DEIS comment period. An additional 15 days of comment can be requested which will be decided by the co-lead agencies.

Sonny Putter asked what time the All Committees Oct. 11 meeting is and noted some people may be out of town. Chairman Kargianis requested the meeting be from 9 a.m. - 12 p.m. The committee members agreed that some people may not be available on that day.

Joan McBride requested that the Sept. 25 Executive Committee meeting be moved to early afternoon. Mr. Cummings said the meeting will be changed to 1:00 p.m. instead of 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Cummings said the All Committee meeting time will be discussed soon. He noted that there will not be a call for action at the meeting. It is for discussion purposes only.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Speakers Bureau schedule. A presentation was made to the Washington State Transportation Commission on August 15 that was similar to the ones made to local jurisdictions. However, the Commissions presentation included a section on WSDOT's reorganization that is not given to jurisdictions. Chairman Kargianis suggested a presentation to the Seattle Rotary would give the program excellent exposure.

Mr. Cummings gave an update on the Outreach Working Group chaired by Sonny Putter. Following is a summary of the meeting with 1000 Friends of Washington and Transportation Choices Coalition held on July 10 and the "areas of agreement" that resulted:

- Goal should include getting people and goods moving in a cost effective way
- Transportation investments need to be made in the I-405 corridor
- Dialogue and communication should continue and be constructive
- There are opportunities to implement some early action strategies that can get people moving quickly and reduce traffic congestion immediately
- 1000 FOW and TCC expressed support for most of the PPA elements

Key issues raised:

- PPA is too costly; not cost effective
- GP lanes will hurt the environment, increase sprawl and arterial trips, impacting neighborhoods
- Need for more analysis
- Will be bringing information and analysis for consideration of a 5<sup>th</sup> Alternative.

Chairman Kargianis said Senator Horn was worried that the program was paying a disproportionately large amount of attention to these group. What does "areas of agreement" mean? Mr. Cummings said it means areas where there is commonality between the goals of the program and the special interest groups.

Senator Horn said the program should be open to meeting with any group. He is concerned, however, with an implication that this group is negotiating an agreement with the program, meaning they were given special status. He said he doesn't like the wording of the meeting summary memo emailed to the committee that said "areas of agreement." He doesn't want to imply the program is negotiating. He's nervous about any agreement that's been made that differs from the general process.

Mayor Putter said Senator Horn is correct in that they can't make special cases or agreements. "Agreement" might have been used inappropriately. What the subcommittee tried to do with the special interest groups was identify areas that the groups agreed and disagreed with the PPA. They didn't make any side agreements with anyone. He said he suspects there are other groups that want to use the subcommittee for avenues of information. Mayor Putter believes it's to the committee's benefit to hear people out and engage them. He said he wants to reassure everyone that the subcommittee is not making deals with anyone.

Senator Horn said he doesn't want to mislead perception. The memo suggested special status, even though that wasn't the intent. The committee has to be very careful, even in terms of general agreement. He said he doesn't even agree with the main program goals listed in the memo. He suggested that since the memo is still a draft, the committee not publish it. He thinks they should get the concerns of other special interest groups, but not give a particular group special status.

Mayor Putter agreed that the subcommittee has to be careful when drafting terms so it's clear what their task and authority is.

Connie Marshall said she shares the senator's concerns. The special interest group is already allowed to be part of the Citizen's Committee. But now they have yet another avenue for their voice. She is especially bothered by development of a "5<sup>th</sup> alternative." She asked if any group can come up with another alternative? She said official alternatives should be identified within the Executive Committee, not externally. She believes the subcommittee should only be to educate the public and that they should educate all groups. She believes the special interest group has stepped over the line in developing a 5<sup>th</sup> alternative.

Mayor Putter said the special interest group is calling their alternative a “5<sup>th</sup> Alternative” but at no time did the subcommittee agree to officially call it that. There has been no commitment on the Executive Committee’s part to acknowledge the “5<sup>th</sup> Alternative.”

Joan McBride said the Executive Committee has always been open to special presentations. The Outreach Working Group is a product of the Executive Committee. She said Mayor Putter is handling the situation well.

Dave Somers said any outside group should be allowed and encouraged to come forward with their ideas until the Executive Committee has made a final decision. He said he doesn’t want to close the process.

Chairman Kargianis said no commitments have been cast in concrete. He requested that “action items” be changed to “follow up.” He also requested that “agreement” be changed to “consensus.” He emphasized the Executive Committee is open to public commentary and that the subcommittee was to meet with groups to try and diffuse any potentially harmful situations. The subcommittee has accomplished the goal of creating a flow of information to the Executive Committee. If more people are allowed to meet with the subcommittee than maybe they’ll be convinced of the program’s potential for success.

Mr. Cummings gave a Funding and Phasing Update:

The Bad News:

- Legislature was unable to reach agreement on funding for I-405 and other regional transportation investments

The Good News:

- Program has sufficient funding to complete planning work and undertake some early action strategies.
- Efforts underway to bring funding issue back to legislature this winter.

Chairman Kargianis asked Senator Horn when the legislature would be back in session. Senator Horn said in January. He said they were very close to reaching an agreement and are still having conversations with the governor. The governor is starting to engage in the situation more actively. He said they are hoping to put together a fourth session that will address a regional bill. There is no opposition to a regional bill except from separating it from a statewide package.

Mr. Somers reiterated concerns about a regional package not being tied to a state package. He expressed support for PSRC maintaining the planning organization they have. He said a state package is important.

Senator Horn said because this region has the worst congestion problem, once a regional package is set up, it will take a while to select a package of funding. He said they don’t need state support until a year or so later.

### **DRAFT EIS UPDATE**

Mr. Cummings gave a Draft EIS Update. On August 17, the DEIS will be distributed to:

- Federal, State & Local Agencies
- Tribes
- Elected Officials
- Committee Members
- Public and Interest Groups
- Ports, Utilities, Railroads, Media
- Libraries

500 total copies of the DEIS will be issued. A free CD version of the DEIS will also be available. WSDOT has already asked if committee members want a CD or a hard copy.

Mr. Cummings noted that a lot of people really worked hard to get the DEIS out. He recognized key players including Kimberley Farley (WSDOT), Christina Martinez (WSDOT), and Jim Leonard (FHWA).

Dick Paylor asked if the 45-day comment period will allow enough time to compile comments for committee consideration before the PA is made. Rita Brogan emphasized that comments need to be directed to Christina or the I-405 email address or else they won't be included in the public record.

Ms. Brogan reviewed the Public Outreach Program to Support the Comment Period. Following is the Comprehensive Outreach on DEIS and public hearings:

- Display ads in regional and community papers
- Media outreach
- Special populations outreach
- Employer outreach
- Neighborhood outreach
- Newsletter, E-news, Municipal Cable Stations
- Website

Ms. Brogan handed out Resource Kits to all members. The kits are to be used as reference in case reporters ask members about the program. An FAQ sheet will be emailed to the members tomorrow.

Mr. Somers said Snohomish County should be getting a display ad, too, and recommended that an ad be placed in the Everett Herald. Mr. Brogan said they will.

Ms. Brogan passed around program factsheets that have been translated into Chinese, Spanish, and Russian for distribution to "Special Populations" in the corridor. She also displayed the program poster announcing the public hearings. Posters are available to the members upon request. She said the team is currently in the process of developing a Citizen's Guide to the DEIS.

The public hearings have been scheduled per the following:

- September 18, 7-9 p.m.  
Northshore Senior Center
- September 19, 7-9 p.m.  
Renton Senior Center
- September 20, 7-9 p.m.  
Bellevue Regional Library

Public open houses will precede hearings from 5-7 p.m.

She said the team would like Executive Committee members to at least participate at the hearing held in their own jurisdiction. Chairman Kargianis asked if the hearings are being held before or after the comments period. Rita said the hearings are part of the comment period.

Mr. Cummings thanked Ann Martin for her work during the DEIS issuance.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS WORKSHOP**

Mr. Cummings turned the meeting over to Christina Martinez who led the Environmental Workshop that included:

- Draft EIS Overview
- Regulatory Environment
- Review Policies and Issues Identified
- Highlights from Analysis

- Early Action Mitigation Overview

Ms. Martinez noted that the information within the DEIS should not surprise members of the Executive Committee because they have been receiving information as it has been developed.

She reviewed the purpose and definition of an EIS Statement:

A disclosure document that will not directly answer the question of what is the best alternative

- Meant to encourage public discussion which includes criticism. All comments will be answered in the Final by the Co-lead agencies
- A middle step in a process that included the following elements being distributed to the cooperating agencies for review and comment
  - Methodology Reports
  - Discipline/Expertise Reports
  - Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement
- The Co-leads had to agree to the content of the document prior to the DEIS being issued.

Ms. Martinez noted that the program will be receiving a great deal of comments. Because the purpose of the DEIS is to encourage comments, she said the committee needs to be ready for the program to receive criticism. The co-leads are responsible for responding to all comments received.

Following are the contents of the Draft EIS Contents:

- Major DEIS Sections
  - Signature sheet
  - Fact sheet
  - Summary
  - Purpose and Needs
  - Description of alternatives
  - Affected Environment
  - Cumulative Impacts
  - List of Preparers
  - Distribution list
  - Comments and coordination
- Appendices Include:
  - Environmental Justice Analysis
  - Draft Preliminary 4(f) Evaluation

Ms. Martinez showed a slide that listed the Areas of the Affected Environment analyzed by the DEIS. She emphasized that the team didn't leave anything out and analyzed almost every part of the environment in the project area.

Each Environmental Subsection includes:

- Background
  - Regulatory
  - Studies and coordination
- Methodology
- Affected Environment
- Impacts of Alternatives
- Mitigation Measures
  - Construction
  - Operation

The next steps of the environmental analysis is:

- Project level environmental documentation under NEPA and SEPA – every element of the environment will be further evaluated as we obtain project level plans
- Once the project level NEPA and SEPA are done, we still have to obtain permits from various agencies.

Ms. Martinez emphasized that the DEIS is a programmatic document that does not contain project specific details which will come later.

Ms. Martinez showed a slide that listed the permits required for the program. She said the team has already coordinated with a lot of jurisdictions on this slide.

Keith McGowan took over the meeting to discuss System Level Criteria. The criteria includes:

- Improve Mobility
- Reduce Congestion
- Improve Safety
- Solutions can be implemented
- Improve Livability
- Environmentally Responsive

The Programmatic Evaluation includes:

- Evaluations commensurate with system-level criteria
- Based on 1% design information
- "Potential" effects reported
- Additional opportunities for avoidance may be possible
- Mitigation would further reduce magnitude and severity of impacts

Livability Criteria – Regional includes the ability to:

- Demonstrate consistency with adopted policies to accommodate planned land uses within study area
- Support vigorous regional and state economy

Key Regional Issues include:

- Urban Growth Area
- Concurrency problem areas
- Employment and housing centers

Avoidance Steps Taken by the program include:

- Removed freeway (I-605) proposed outside Urban Growth Area
- Removed arterial improvements proposed outside Urban Growth Area

Mr. McGowan also showed slides that depicted the Change in Study Area Housing and the Change in Study Area Employment. He noted that the differences between the alternatives are quite small.

The Regional Economic Impact of the program includes:

- Under the No Action Alt, the extent to which congestion may limit overall growth is uncertain
- Overall levels of employment and economic activity in the region are not expected to change substantially in response to congestion
- There is a point at which congestion can cause firms and workers to locate elsewhere. Several major employers in the region have expressed this concern.

Chairman Kargianis said the first bullet is counterintuitive. He argued that No Action would have a detrimental effect. Mr. McGowan agreed that a number of employers have expressed concern. However, in the EIS they are not able to take it to an empirical level.

Senator Horn said congestion has already impacted employment in the area. He argued that Boeing left the area partly because of transportation issues. He said the mayor of Renton has written a letter requesting help from the legislature regarding transportation. He said that the effect on the region's economy is not hypothesis, it's a fact that transportation issues are hurting employment and employers.



Mr. McGowan showed a slide titled What If We Do Nothing?:

- Concurrency limits are triggered
- Population and employment spreads outside urbanized area
- Increased demands on public services and the environment

Mr. McGowan showed a map of the region that depicted No Action Traffic Conditions (2020).

The Benefits of Taking Action will include:

- Improved connectivity and accessibility in the study area
- Population and employment increase within the study area (i.e. Urban Growth Area)
- Tendencies for land use clustering and support for transit-oriented development

Livability Criteria – Local includes:

- Minimize and/or mitigate impacts to neighborhoods (displaced households, businesses, parks and open spaces)
- Minimize impacts to visual quality
- Minimize negative impacts on minority and/or low income populations (environmental justice)

Key local issues include:

- Parks and recreational resources
- Residential and business displacements
- Views
- Historic sites

Mr. McGowan also provided slides that showed a summary of the Affected Parcels in the program as well as Affected Recreational, Cultural and Historic Resources. He said that the “historic resources” analyzed by the program are ones that are officially listed on the historic register. These particular resources meet a narrow definition. There are other historic places within the project area that don’t meet the definition.

The program defines Environmental Justice as:

- No high and adverse human health or environmental effects of the proposed improvements are expected to fall disproportionately on minority or low-income populations
- The program is consistent with the policy established in EO 12898 and FHWA Order 6640.23

Mr. McGowan showed slides that illustrated Avoidance and Mitigation Opportunities. At one percent design, Mr. McGowan noted that the program has tried to avoid any properties they could and has tried to keep the project on a narrow footprint. He said they don’t want to require more right-of-way than necessary.

Mr. McGowan said Key Views to and from the project area were analyzed and found not to be much different from the current views.

The Environmentally Responsive Criteria for the program is to:

- Minimize impacts to air quality
- Minimize noise impacts
- Minimize impacts to water quantity and quality
- Minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas
- Minimize indirect impacts

The Key Issues are:

- Regional air quality trends
- Noise impacts

Mr. McGowan showed slides that illustrated Puget Sound Carbon Monoxide and Ozone Trends. He also showed a slide illustrating Air Emissions in the years 2020. He said that there is a slight improvement from No Action to Alt 4.

Air Quality for All Alternatives:

- Emissions not expected to exceed the transportation CO budget
- Conformity to the MTP and TIP will be determined when improvements are included in the official PSRC analysis.
- Other criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed the AQMP emissions budgets through 2030.

Dave Somers said there is a regional air quality problem that needs to be recognized.

Mr. McGowan showed a slide depicting the program's Noise Affected Areas. He asked the committee to note that the slide data is prior to mitigation and doesn't include existing noise mitigation in the area. This approach was run because of the level of evaluation the program is currently in. It's expected that these numbers would be reduced substantially with mitigation.

Mr. McGowan showed a slide illustrating Year 2020 Traffic Noise. He said that the No Action condition is already reaching a long ways out from I-405. He also said that the slide shows pre-mitigation levels. He emphasized that all of the noise slides data show figures prior to mitigation.

Mr. McGowan said that topography and distance will have an effect on mitigation brought to the program areas.

He discussed Avoidance and Mitigation opportunities for added program noise levels. Mr. McGowan said that mitigation is a requirement and that there are specific guidelines that will be brought to the project.

The Key Issues for Wetlands, Water and Fish are:

- Clean water
- Natural flow conditions
- Water temperatures
- Access to spawning habitat

Mr. McGowan showed slides and discussed Wetland Resources, Acres of Wetlands Affected and High Priority Wetlands Affected.

Mitigation Opportunities include:

- Avoidance
- Wetlands enhancements

Impervious Surface Key Issues include:

- Groundwater recharge
- Flow control
- Stormwater runoff
- Sole source aquifers

Mr. McGowan showed a slide illustrating Impervious Surface Impacts. He said that the impacts are relative to the impervious surface in the area. He noted that the effects of the projects are small.

Mr. McGowan showed a slide illustrating the program's Decrease in Recharge Area.

Cumulative Impacts of the program include:

- The No Action Alternative would increase impervious area by .1 percent across the study area

- The action alternatives would increase impervious area by .2 to .7 percent relative to No Action
- Pollutant loads, base flows, and water temperature could remain substantial problems for many streams draining the study area

Mitigation Opportunities include:

- Stormwater treatment
- Retrofit opportunities
- Detention and infiltration

Mr. McGowan noted that the urban area has been so heavily affected that the damage will remain for a long time even with much mitigation.

Mr. McGowan showed slides that illustrate the Riparian Encroachments and the Encroachments in Critical Streams by the program. These slides are in conjunction with streams that provide protection for fish habitat. He said that the analysis has been taken really far.

Cumulative Impacts are:

- I-405 Corridor Program action alternatives could relieve pressure for growth in rural areas that contain the most functional fish habitat.
- None of the alternatives would change the trends in salmon populations in the central Puget Sound region – either positively or adversely. He noted that accessibility has improved in the area.

Mr. McGowan discussed Mitigation Opportunities.

The meeting was turned over to Bruce Smith who discussed the Early-Action Mitigation Proposal, which includes:

- Goal and early-action objective for environmental impact mitigation
- Report on early-action mitigation
- Draft schedule for developing an early-action mitigation proposal for I-405.

Mr. Smith said there are many environmental impact mitigation opportunities that have been identified but will have to be considered later. In addition, there are several opportunities for early action. The program is intended to mitigate and even enhance the environment.

The Goals and Early-Action Objective for Environmental Impact Mitigation includes:

- Have a positive impact on the environment for critical resources
- Take early-action (pre-construction) to:
  - Mitigate for any unavoidable impacts on critical resources in the watersheds affected
  - Expedite project delivery
  - Enhance critical resources

The Report on Early Action Mitigation will outline a process for making decisions on early-action environmental impact mitigation proposals.

Following is a Draft Schedule for Developing an Early-Action Mitigation Proposal:

- Sept 01 – Complete early-action mitigation report and present to agencies
- Oct 01 – Get agreement on process and objectives
- Dec 01 – Develop early action mitigation proposal to include in the DEIS

A round of Q & A regarding the Environmental Workshop was led by Ann Martin, Kimberly Farley, Christina Martinez and Keith McGowan.

Mr. Somers asked how the program will receive credit for early action efforts. Mr. Smith said there is a model for wetlands mitigation that outlines the process for arriving at decisions. Mr. Somers said the key is early coordination with agencies and tribes and getting credit for mitigation.

Ms. Farley said WSDOT currently has several tools under the Alternative Mitigation Policy that would allow them to find a location somewhere else in the watershed to put together mitigation for areas that can't be mitigated.

David Dye said one of the reasons of bringing projects under one roof is to increase the buying power of all mega projects. They want to push the envelope and invent new processes. The goal is to talk about programmatic permitting, environmental mitigation banking and off-site mitigation. They will also look at streamlining. He suggested this topic is probably worth its own meeting. He said they will bring a game plan back after it matures. Chairman Kargianis agreed and requested that he be kept up-to-date.

Mr. Somers said Snohomish has a wetland banking program the team might want to look at.

Grant Deginger said asked if the Cumulative Impacts figures from the slide are prior to mitigation? Mr. McGowan answered that they are. Ms. Farley said "cumulative impacts" refer to what the project impacts may be in addition to the impacts from all other projects in the area. The project isn't responsible for the mitigation of all the cumulative impacts, just its own. But the team is required to look at what the I-405 project will do to the area in relation to other projects.

Ms. McBride asked when the team would get the findings on cumulative impacts regarding the area around SR 167. Ms. Martinez emphasized that the project is currently in the program level and won't get into specific details until the project level. The team will look at impacts again at that time.

Ms. McBride asked how the Renton community will know if the PA will impact their watershed area. Mr. Cummings said the slides are broken down by watersheds. They have done the initial work on SR 167/I-405 and will bring back the information to discuss how it will be addressed. The team will do its best to get the information out even though the matter is a project level task.

Chairman Kargianis clarified that "mitigation" implies water, noise, etc.

Senator Horn said that all the alternatives are not meeting their goals. The only one that meets the program goal is Alternative 3.

Chairman Kargianis asked if the adverse impacts from No Action is documented. Ms. Farley said yes. Mr. McGowan said there is a lot of documentation that says the alternatives are better than no action. Chairman Kargianis asked if there's one slide that shows this? Mr. McGowan said the information should be looked at as a whole. Chairman Kargianis asked if they can make a slide that shows the overall information? Mr. Cummings said the team has to be cautious because the concept of "positive" is in the eyes of the reader. Chairman asked if the committees could have this slide for their own benefit. Ms. Farley said the DEIS is legally required to disclose all the information. Chairman Kargianis said he would like additional information. Ms. Farley said that part of the DEIS is for people to make their own judgments on if the alternatives are positive. She said they can not make the decisions for them.

Mayor Putter asked how the benefits of the Taking Action slide is documented in the DEIS. Mr. McGowan said the benefits are documented based upon modeling by PSRC and in comparison to previous studies. The sum of the studies is repeated in text and graphics within DEIS.

Mr. Putter commented that some may say the middle bullet is implying the opposite of what it's really saying. Ms. Farley said the PSRC model they used says the program doesn't increase sprawl.

David Hopkins, representing Harold Taniguchi, asked if there is an assessment of change relative to the particular type of facility regarding Impervious Surfaces? Mr. Cummings said this is a step further than where they are currently. He said they do have lane miles for existing and opposed. Mr. Hopkins asked if the slide is referring to "acres" or "areas?" Mr. Cummings said the slide had a typo and that it's referring to acres.

Randy Corman requested normalized charts related to number of trips. He said he wants the charts to show that the program will be successful in increasing the number of trips without hurting the environment. He suggested this be a supplement because the current charts don't successfully show it, even though it's what they mean. Chairman Kargianis said he wants it to be available to members who want it.

Chairman Kargianis said that bullet 2 of the Regional Economic Impact slide is almost saying that basically there are no current problems with the economy and job opportunity. Chairman Kargianis said it implies that if we don't do anything, it won't get any worse, but this is not true. Ms. Farley said the EIS is to provide a scientific basis for their conclusions. They used the PSRC model to conclude what would happen and it is not sensitive enough to show this. They have to report what the model says. She said different people have different opinions of what would happen and they can't report all of these opinions. Chairman Kargianis said the team should include wording that there is no current study that says either way.

Mayor Putter agreed that it's appropriate to state the models say impacts can't be shown sufficiently.

Mr. Deginger said there is a precise set of data presented. How can they have data for one but not for the other? Mr. McGowan said financial choices that individuals and businesses make in regards to congestion are dynamic. Mr. McGowan said, for instance, they haven't analyzed intersection congestion for every city. There are concurrency problems out there, but we can't take the next step of saying if you do or don't do that, the city is going to have to stop development. Mr. Deginger asked why not?

Chairman Kargianis asked if this was going to be an emerging study? Ms. Martinez said this report is only for generating comments. Chairman Kargianis said they will identify this information and will get more scientific about it.

Mr. Cummings said the team will make the changes Mayor Putter suggested.

Mr. Somers said there are other points that are counterintuitive. Chairman Kargianis said this bullet is pivotal for community support. Mr. Somers said the program needs to keep some objective measures instead of focusing on opinion. The program needs quantitative assessment. He cautioned against giving conclusions that don't have supporting background. Chairman Kargianis said the document should specify that there is no support for these conclusions yet.

Mayor Paylor said there are quantitative studies that note how much money everyone is losing in relation to how much time they spend in traffic. Can't they include that information? Mr. Cummings said they have this information in the cost analysis benefits that was done outside of the EIS. Mr. Davis said we are limited on the outside information we can include in the EIS.

Senator Horn said bullet 3 needs to include the fact that one significant employer (Boeing) has already left. Mr. Somers said that Boeing noted congestion was a reason for leaving, but other factors were even bigger.

Chairman Kargianis said he's comfortable w/bullet 3, but not with bullet 2. He said he would like to revisit bullet 2 later.

Mr. Dye asked if the slides were actual extractions of what's in the EIS? Mr. McGowan said it's a summary. Mr. Dye said it's very possible that you may see something close to this in the EIS. Mr. Cummings said it's impossible to summarize lots of pages and interpret it in a way that's not

controversial. This bullet point is more like the author's interpretation of the EIS. Ms. Farley said the PMT will send the Executive Committee cds of the entire document.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.